## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA ASHEVILLE DIVISION 1:14cv122

MICHAEL A. KITCHEN, et al.,	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	ORDER
SHAWN MILLER, et al.,	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

Pending before the Court is the Motion to Reopen Discovery [# 65].

Defendants move the Court to reopen discovery in this case. The Court **DENIES** the motion [# 65].

## I. Analysis

Discovery in this case closed June 1, 2016. Summary Judgment motions were due July 1, 2016. On June 28, 2016, well after the close of discovery, Defendants moved to reopen discovery for a period of at least sixty days.

Defendants contend that this extension was necessary as the result of Plaintiff Michael Kitchen's decision to live off the grid in the woods without contact with his family or attorney.

Previously, this Court denied Plaintiffs' motion to extend the pretrial deadlines in this case. (Order, Jan. 20, 2016, ECF No. 50.) As the Court

previously stated:

While the Court is cognizant of the difficult situation that Mr. Kitchen's

decision to go live in the woods without informing people of where he might be living poses on counsel, the Court cannot allow the actions of

Mr. Kitchen to delay the resolution of a civil action that he brought

against Defendants. If Mr. Kitchen is not serious about prosecuting his claims and would rather disappear into the woods than participate in

discovery, then he may certainly decide to do so. This Court, however,

will not allow such actions to delay the resolution of this civil

proceedings.

(<u>Id.</u>) Rather than move to compel Plaintiff Michael Kitchen to respond to

discovery or compel his deposition during the discovery period, however,

Defendants decided to wait and do nothing until nearly four weeks after the close

of discovery. Defendants have simply waited too long to seek assistance from the

Court in managing the discovery process in this case. Defendants could, and

should, have filed their motions during the discovery period instead of waiting

nearly a month after the close of discovery to compel discovery and to reopen

discovery. Upon a review of the record in this case and the relevant legal

authority, the Court **DENIES** the motion.

II. Conclusion

The Court **DENIES** the Motion to Reopen Discovery [# 65].

Signed: July 12, 2016

Dennis L. Howell
United States Magistrat

United States Magistrate Judge

Dewalf I rime